

**JOURNAL OF THE
SOCIETY FOR ARMENIAN STUDIES**



VOLUME 24 (2015)

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR ARMENIAN STUDIES
VOLUME 24 (2015)

CONTENTS

1 *Editor's note*

ARTICLES

3 Framing Khoja Sefer in the Sala Regia of the Quirinal Palace in Rome
(1610-1617)

Cristelle Baskins

29 Grigor Marzvanec'i and Armenian Book Illustration

Dickran Kouymjian

44 The Meskeneh Concentration Camp, 1915-1917: A Case Study of Power,
Collaboration, and Humanitarian Resistance during the Armenian Genocide

Khatchig Mouradian

56 Beyond the Analytical Categories of Armenian Identity

Daniel Fittante

81 The Armenian Apostolic Church in Contemporary Times (1991-2011):
Political Changes in Armenia and Social Challenges of the Last Three
Catholicos of Etchmiadzin. Part I: Vazgen I and Garegin I

Levon Petrosyan

COMMUNICATIONS

112 Relations between Tragedy and Historical Experience in Plutarch
(*Crassus*, 33)

Albert Stepanyan

124 Armenian *World-Economy* and the Challenges of the Industrial Era in the
Light of Fernand Braudel's Civilization Theory

Smbat Hovannisyan

132 Cemal Pasha's 1919 German Op-ed and the German Sources on the
Armenian Genocide

Stefan Ihrig

138 The Armenians of South Milwaukee: Patterns of Residence and Mobility

Russell Kashian and David Luhrssen

146 Addendum to A New Armenian Inscription from the City of David,
Jerusalem

Michael E. Stone, Doron Ben-Ami, and Yana Tchekhanovets

REVIEW ESSAY

- 148** Edmund V. Azadian, Sylvie L. Merian, eds., Lucy Ardash, coordinator.
Forward by Thomas F. Mathews, *Legacy of Armenian Treasures: Testimony
to a People. The Alex and Marie Manoogian Museum*
Dickran Kouymjian

REVIEWS

- 158** Stefan Ihrig, *Atatürk in the Nazi Imagination*
Ümit Kurt
- 160** Valentina Calzolari, ed., *Armenian Philology in the Modern Era*
Sergio La Porta
- 162** Armen T. Marsoobian, *Fragments of a Lost Homeland: Remembering
Armenia*
Barlow Der Mugrdechian

ARMENIAN *WORLD-ECONOMY* AND THE CHALLENGES OF THE INDUSTRIAL ERA IN THE LIGHT OF FERNAND BRAUDEL'S CIVILIZATION THEORY

SMBAT HOVHANNISYAN

Civilizations are in “a constant drift of transformation.” While keeping some of their characteristics for centuries, or even for millennia, they undergo conversions resulting in qualitative leaps and the successive replacement of civilizations. Elsewhere, I have had the opportunity to speak about the “civilizational shifts” that occurred at the dawn of the Early Modern period (16th-17th centuries) as a pre-Industrial civilization was replaced by an Industrial one.¹ The change was accompanied by the profound developments on various levels of social life.²

According to Fernand Braudel, the consequence of continuously growing economic, political, and cultural ties was the increased role of “world time,” which “then might be said to concentrate above all on a kind of superstructure of world history” in the life of humanity.³ To recapitulate his argument, the historian derives the terms “world economy” and “world-economy” from this basic concept. Despite their significant closeness, these concepts have essential differences. In particular, “world economy is an expression applied to the whole world,” while “world-economy only concerns a fragment of the world.”⁴ Through the juxtaposition of the semantic fields of the concepts of “world time,” “world-economy,” and “global history,” Braudel reflects on the essence of the “global history.”

In this essay, we will attempt to delineate the role of the Armenian trade network in the relations between the East and the West during the Early Modern period. For this purpose, we suggest formulating this network as a “world-economy,” which was characterized by the following components:

- Boundaries that defined it and gave it an identity;
- The presence of an invariably available urban center;
- The markings of a hierarchy.⁵

Let us now try to detail the phenomenon of the Armenian trade network as a world-economy, based on the components listed above.

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA AND CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION

The Armenian trade network embraced a huge ethno-political area stretching from Philippines, China, India, Iraq, and the Ottoman Empire to Europe (Muscovite Russia, Poland, Sweden, the Netherlands, France, Italy, and England) all the way to the gates of America.⁶ In the center was historic Armenia under the yoke of Iran and the Ottoman Empire. In approaching the problem from Braudel's point of view, it

¹ Smbat Hovhannisyan, “Examination of Armenian Trade Capital (16th-18th centuries) in Light of Fernand Braudel's Civilization Theory,” *Armenian Review* 54.3-4 (Spring-Summer 2014): 45–59.

² See Fernand Braudel, *Grammaire des civilisations* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1993), 413–14.

³ Fernand Braudel, *Civilization and capitalism, 15th–18th century*, trans. Siân Reynolds (New York: Harper and Row, 1984), 3:18.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁵ Fernand Braudel, *La dynamique du capitalisme* (Paris: Flammarion, 1988), 85–86.

⁶ Braudel, *Civilization and capitalism*, 2:156.

becomes obvious that the Armenian merchants represented a whole world-economy, which conjoined other “world-economies” and various states. Within this context, the main routes of exchanging goods with European countries were the Tabriz-Erzurum-Tokat-Constantinople, Tabriz-Erzurum-Tokat-Smyrna, Tabriz-Erzurum-Trabzon international transit routes.⁷

The other vital direction laid from the Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean. It stretched through the Isfahan-Mahest-Yezdkhas-Shiraz-Lar-Bander-Abbas caravan route.⁸ The main centers of the Persian-Indian sea trade were the sea ports of Bander-Abbas, Bander-Bashir, and Basra at the Persian Gulf, as well as the port of Surat, located on India’s western seashore.⁹ Armenian merchants preferred the land routes to India rather than the sea routes. Those routes would cross the Caspian Sea to Khorasan, then further to Qandahar and Basra, and to Delhi.¹⁰ India was not a final destination for the merchants, though. They headed to Burma, Siam, Nepal, Tibet, Indonesia, Philippines, the Malayan Archipelago, among others.¹¹ Starting from the second half of the 16th century, the new Volga-Caspian route became more widely used for commercial purposes to exchange goods between the East and the West.¹² It was much shorter compared to the land route across the Ottoman Empire, which started to develop in the early 18th century.

GEOGRAPHIC CENTER

Starting from the early 17th century, New Jugha (New Julfa) undertook the role of geographic center of this vast trading network. Upon the initiative and patronage of Shah Abbas, New Jugha turned into the largest and the most important center of the Armenian trade network: “It was the total transformation of New Jugha and, because of that transformation, it was the Armenian trade capital that played the role in the life of the Armenian community by becoming a serious factor, just like the trade capital did in many parts of Europe, by pulling humanity out of the Middle Ages and pushing it to the new times.”¹³ At the same time “it became a sort of a reason that would activate and internationalize the capital belonging to the *khajah*-s in various villages in the Arax Valley.”¹⁴

With a special statute issued in 1605, Shah Abbas allotted to the residents of Jugha a wide piece of land located on the right bank of the Zayenderood River from the

⁷ Manvel K. Zulalyan, *Jalalineri sharzhumē ev hay zhoghovrdi vichakē Osmanyan kaysrut'yan mej* (Jelalis' Movement and Life Conditions of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire) (Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1966), 38.

⁸ Vahan Bayburdyan, *Hamashkharhayin arewturē ew iranahayut'wnē 17-rd darum* (International Trade and Armenian Merchants in the Seventeenth Century) (Tehran, 1996), 210.

⁹ Mesrobian J. Seth, *Armenians in India. From the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (New Delhi: Oxford and IBH, 1983), 290 and 293.

¹⁰ Sebouh Aslanian, *From the Indian Ocean to the Mediterranean, The Global Trade Networks of Armenian Merchants from New Julfa* (Berkeley-New York-London: University of California Press, 2011), 221.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 227.

¹² Vahan H. Papazyan, *Hayastani arevtrakan ulinerē mijazgayin arevtri olortum XVI-XVII dd.* (Trade Routes of Armenia in International Commerce of the 16th-17th Centuries) (Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1990), 80.

¹³ Leo [Arakel Babakhanian], *Khoyayakan kapitalē yev nra k'aghak'akan-hasarakakan derē hayeri mej* (Merchant Capital and its Political and Public Role Among the Armenians) (Erevan: State Publishing House, 1934), 66.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 74.

“khassah” (crown lands) lands belonging to the shah in the southern part of Isfahan. This is where the new settlement was built and called New Jugha after the ruined Jugha.¹⁵ Armenians built New Jugha by dividing it into districts according to associations of compatriotic unions (Armenians of Jugha, Yerevan, Dasht, etc.): “they erected buildings and dwellings for themselves with marvelous decoration, solid streets, winged castles, cool attics, with high and kingly constructs, decorated them with golden and blue spar colored flowers, which would please the viewer.”¹⁶

Interested in the development of Persia’s external trade and engaging Armenians in the matter, Shah Abbas came up with a plan to “move” Etchmiadzin with a purpose to bind Armenians to Persia with stronger ties. For this, Etchmiadzin was supposed to be dismantled and moved to Isfahan part by part and reconstructed as “New Etchmiadzin.” This way the capital of Persia would also become the residence of the Armenian Apostolic Church.¹⁷ Despite the fact that the plan never came into being, the “power levers” spreading from New Jugha, the center, began to organize, regulate and to some extent manage the huge route of international land trade. They tended to form a unified system, the two main components of which, the center and the periphery, started to function in a rhythmic accord.

Braudel’s attention did not overlook the Armenian example; he devoted a separate section in his *Civilization and Capitalism*, entitled “Armenians and Jews,” that reflected on the evolution of the Armenian trade network.¹⁸ Referring to the acquisition and redistribution of the “spheres of influence,” he comments that “trade circuits and communications were regularly dominated by powerful groups who appropriated them and might forbid other groups to use them.”¹⁹ By contrast, Braudel concludes that the evolution of the Armenian trade network took place by a more flexible and comprehensive system.

THE HIERARCHIC STRUCTURE

To continue the previous idea, it is worth mentioning that New Jugha was connected commercially and economically (as well as in other ways) to the Armenian communities in the various corners of the world. A unique supra-border entity emerged “based on a clear-cut hierarchy”: “Jugha gained a serious authority and no national issue could be solved without its consent. Etchmiadzin was subordinate to it, and the decisive voice in choosing Catholicos belonged to it.”²⁰ This predominance had formed a network of connections, which united Surat, Madras, Calcutta, Constantinople, Astrakhan, Moscow, Krakow, Lvov, Venice, Amsterdam, and other centers. A truly serious national capital was circulated. Indeed, the “peripheral centers” had operational liberty and were tied to the center mostly for practical economic matters and for the purposes of self-defense.

The emerging system, generally, was aimed at supporting self-innovation for Armenian national life, providing movement from traditional pre-Industrial society to

¹⁵ Bayburdyan, *Hamashkharhayin arewturē*, 42.

¹⁶ Aṛak’el Davrižec’i (Aṛak’el of Tabriz), *Patmut’iwn* (History), ed. G. Abgaryan et al. (Erevan: Sovetakan Grogh, 1988), p. 60.

¹⁷ Vahan Bayburdyan, *Nor Jugha* (New Julfa) (Erevan : Armenian Academy of Sciences, 2007), 47.

¹⁸ Braudel, *Civilization and capitalism*, 2:154-60.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 153.

²⁰ Leo [Arakel Babakhanian], *Erkeri zhoghovatsu* (Collected works) (Erevan: Hayastan Press, 1986), 5:194.

an Industrial one. In other words, the Armenians were on the way towards modernization, which would make it possible to reassert the “harmonious relationships between cultural meaning and civilizational sign.”²¹ However, to fulfill the mission, it was necessary to work out proportionate responses to the civilizational challenges of the time. We underline the importance of three of them:

- Translocation of trade (mostly, Mediterranean) by caravans and by land to an “oceanic environment,” according to the newest trading and management technologies;
- Mastering the newest banking technologies and providing new perspectives for the evolution of capital;
- Laying the foundations of the national state, which in its turn would enable formation of the modern Armenian nation-state.

By juxtaposing Braudel’s theory and the developments of Armenian history that followed, we will try to define the extent to which the Armenian merchants managed to meet the raising civilizational challenges. This will help to properly and comprehensively evaluate their role within the context of Armenian and world history.

THE CHALLENGE OF MOVING FROM THE CARAVAN AND LAND TRADE TO SEA TRADE

In our previous article, we reflected upon this major issue within the context of European history and we noted that it radically changed the shape and the structure of the economic relationships between the East and the West.²² In particular, as a consequence of this development, trade via the Mediterranean Sea and through Russia gradually lost its role and efficiency. Europe built its commercial ties with the East mostly via sea and ocean. Large trade and banking unions emerged in London, Amsterdam, Paris, Lisbon, Hamburg and elsewhere, which had vast financial means, navies, armed forces, and administrations. They entertained the overt support of the states: England, the Netherlands, France, and Portugal. At the same time, pirates, who, despite acting beyond the realms of the law, considered themselves after all Englishmen, Dutch, or French,²³ gained significant force in the seas.

Under those conditions, the caravan and land trade of the Armenian merchants was marginalized and lost promise.²⁴ It was left outside of global mainstream developments. Starting from the second half of the 17th century, the harsh competition of European entrepreneurs made itself more tangible. It first touched Surat, and later also the littoral towns of India (Calcutta, Madras). The Portuguese and the French were the most actively involved in the process, but soon the English overtook their position. They would act quite purposefully.²⁵ Initially, while their positions were still weak, they decided to set control over the Armenian merchants of

²¹ Albert Step’anyan, *Ink’nut’yan azgayin ch’apumě* (The national aspect of identity), in *Ink’nut’yan harc’er. Taregirk’*, ed. A. Step’anyan (Erevan: Zangak, 2002), 25.

²² See also Nathan Rosenberg and L. E. Birdzell Jr., *How the West Grew Rich: The Economic Transformation of the Industrial World* (New York: Basic Books, 1986).

²³ See Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean world in the age of Phillip II*, trans. by Siân Reynolds (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 2:865-91.

²⁴ See Y.G. Barsegov, “Iz istorii bor’by Armjanskogo kupečestvo protiv Evropejskogo piratstva v XVII v.” (From the struggle of Armenian merchants against Europeans pirates in the 17th c.), *Patma-banasirakan handes* 2 (1984): 35-42.

²⁵ Braudel, *Civilization and capitalism*, 3:503-11.

India. It started with an agreement signed in 1688 between the East Indian Company and the Armenians.²⁶ The interests of the Armenian merchants were represented by Khojah Panos Calendar (Phanoos Khalanthar). One of the most important clauses of the contract stipulated that the Armenian merchants would further entertain the right to export their goods using the routes controlled by the English, using the havens, warehouses, and ships belonging to the latter.²⁷

According to Leo's pertinent characterization, "the khojah, who traverses the land routes and leads caravans, turns into a seafarer and trader on the ocean."²⁸ The characterization holds optimistic overtones, although is far from being historical. As it further happened, the majority of Armenian merchants turned out to be very indifferent to the potentials the agreement afforded. Not a single step was made to bring their activities in line with the requirements of the time and to adapt to a new surrounding: "Armenian merchants involved in caravan trade were not interested in the implementation of this agreement at all."²⁹ The agreement remained on paper and simply turned into a noteworthy historical document. The reasons for this disregard should be looked for in the national mentality of the Armenians. It had not shrugged off the burden of tradition, and remained generally detached from the newest European intellectual trends and technological achievements.

On a wider scale, the Armenian merchants did not (and could not) yet perceive themselves as representatives of the newly formed nation (Industrial Era), whose main social concern was the renovation or the restoration of its own state.

THE CHALLENGE OF MOVING FROM USURY RELATIONSHIPS TO BANKING

Monetary and credit payments gradually gained significance with the establishment of pre-Industrial civilization. Large trading companies required large credits. The issue of credit traders acquired crucial importance, especially with respect to the transfers of money from one country to another. "Non-cash money operations" were applied for the first time using bills of exchange and demand notes. The transfer of money from one place to another, or from one country to another, had become complicated for merchants involved in international trade, especially as there was always the threat of being robbed. Ways of crediting and money transfer became widely used; and the system of banking emerged, based on this need.³⁰ The mentioned period (16th-17th c.) was a benchmark that boosted banking as a separate and necessary sector of economics.

To be sure, the Armenian merchants could not stay unaffected by these deep-rooted moves that occurred on both the civilizational and economical levels. There is evidence that during the 17th and early-18th centuries Armenian merchants managed to develop a system that met the needs of the new times for credit and the transfer of capital.³¹ In medieval Iran and neighboring countries, which were in close

²⁶ Seth, *Armenian in India*, 48.

²⁷ *Azgasēr* (Calcutta) 2.38 (1846): 139; see [http://tert.nla.am/archive/NLA%20AMSAGIR/Azgaser/1846/1846\(38\).pdf](http://tert.nla.am/archive/NLA%20AMSAGIR/Azgaser/1846/1846(38).pdf) (accessed 19.12.2014).

²⁸ Leo, *Khojayakan kapitalē*, 85.

²⁹ Papazyan, *Hayastani arevtrakan ulinerē*, 80.

³⁰ Braudel, *Civilization and capitalism*, 2:390-95.

³¹ Shushanik Khachikyan, *Nor Jughayi hay vacharakanut'yunē yev nra arevtratntesakan kaperē Rusastani het XVII-XVIII darerum* (The Armenian trade of New Julfa and its commercial and economic ties with Russia in the 17th-18th Centuries) (Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1988), 172.

commercial relations with it, “cheques” were widely used among Armenian merchants.³² The unique kind of “cheques” used by the Armenian merchants had two types. The first one, which was the most widely used, had many names. The terms known in New Jugha were *avak* (bill of exchange), *zmei avak* (bill of exchange with warrantee), and *zmei bi juk’am avak* (a non-deposit bill of exchange with warrantee). In Astrakhan and Armenia the widely known term was *barat*, in India it was *hendvi* (*hundi*). The second type was called *juk’mi avak* (bill of exchange given for goods or deposit). When travelling for commercial purposes, the merchant would leave money with a moneychanger, who worked in a given location and had counterparts in other places, and would receive a relevant demand note. Upon arrival at his destination he would receive his money from the partner of the moneychanger in exchange for his “cheque” for a commission.³³

Having been actively involved in monetary relationships, the Armenian merchants even had a bank “of their own.”³⁴ Despite this, they never managed to extract themselves completely from the usury system of regulating monetary relationships inherited from the Middle Ages. The representatives of Armenian trade capital appear to have been unable to fully appreciate the advantages of the banking system and mostly remained confined to “cash money and on-hand commerce.”

THE PROBLEM OF RESTORING NATIONAL STATEHOOD

The attempts of the Armenians to restore state-sovereignty received new momentum starting from the second half of the 17th century and gradually grew systematic. The process has been comprehensively covered by modern Armenian historiography, and a number of outstanding researchers have contributed to this.³⁵ Hence, touching upon the details of this issue is beyond the scope of our problem. Our purpose is to discuss the algorithm of actions aimed at the restoration of the statehood, the integral part of the revitalization of the Armenian national identity.

This algorithm represented approximately the following picture: in 1677 Catholicos Hakob Jughayets’i initiated a secret meeting in Etchmiadzin with an aim of appealing to European powers to liberate “Christian Armenia from the Muslim yoke”;³⁶ 1690-1710 Israel Ori initiated activities to liberate Armenia first with the support of Europe (Pfalz, Florence, Austrian Empire), and later with that of Russia; between 1722 and 1730 the national liberation movement in Syunik and Artsakh

³² Ibid., 168.

³³ Ibid. See also, Edmund Herzig, “Borrowed terminology and shared techniques in New Julfa Armenian commercial documents,” in *Iran and the World in the Safavid Age*, ed. Willem Floor and Edmund Herzig (London: I.B. Tauris, 2012), 447-58.

³⁴ Vardges Mik’ayelyan, *Ghrimi haykakan gaghuti patmut’yun* (History of the Armenian community of Crimea) (Erevan: Armenian Academy of Sciences, 1969), 147.

³⁵ See Ashot Hovhannisyan, *Drvagner hay azatagrakan mtk’i patmut’yan* (Episodes from Armenian national liberation movement), vol. 1 (Yerevan: Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences, 1957) and vol. 2 (Yerevan: Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences, 1969); Zulalyan, *Jalalineri sharzhumē*; Manvel K. Julalyan, *Hay zhoghovrdi patmut’yan hartserē ēst evropatsi heghinakneri, XIII-XVIII dd.* (Problems in the Armenians’ history according to European authors, 13th-18th centuries), vol. 1 (Yerevan: Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences, 1990); Hakob Anasyan, *XVII dari azatagrakan sharzhumnern Arevmtyan Hayastanum: patmakan hetazotut’yun* (17th-c liberation movements in Western Armenia: Historical research) (Yerevan: Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences, 1961); Abgar Ioannisian, *Iosif Emin* (Joseph Emin) (Yerevan: Izd-vo AN Armenian SSR, 1945).

³⁶ Leo, *Erkeri zhoghovatsu*, 3:337.

under the leadership of Davit' Bek and Esayi Hasan-Jalalyan, the Catholicos of Gandzasar emerged; in 1750-1770 Hovsep' Emin (Joseph Emin) made incessant efforts to liberate the homeland with the support of Russia and Georgia on the one hand, and by an all-national armed rebellion on the other; in 1760-1790 active diplomatic relationships with the Russian royal court and detailed liberation plans were set with the participation of Movses Sarafyan, Hovsep' Arghut'yan, and Shahamir Shahamiryan. The period is also marked by an unprecedented initiative to define the exact legal and political boundaries of the future Armenia.³⁷ In this light the activities of the Madras Group inspired by the ideas of Hovsep Emin, Movses Baghramyan, and Shahamir Shahamiryan are worth mentioning. Three seminal works were created in that period: the *Snare of Glory (Orogayt parats')*, *A Tract Called Target (Tetrak or koch'i nshavak)*, and *New Tract Called Exhortations (Nor Tetrak or koch'i yordorak)*. They were built on the progressive (enlightenment) theories of law, historiography, and politics of the times.³⁸

This "algorithm of actions," however, did not yield the anticipated result: Armenian statehood was not restored. The reasons varied. Among them scholars put forth the feudal backwardness of the country,³⁹ large-scale emigration,⁴⁰ foreign (Ottoman and Persian) domination,⁴¹ the vicissitudes of Russian foreign policies,⁴² the unfriendly attitude of the European powers,⁴³ etc. Of course, each of the mentioned issues reflects some aspect of historical truth. However, the problem has not received appropriate illumination from a civilizational perspective, which is able to reveal essential realities of history.

An inquiry into the problem from a civilizational perspective witnesses the following. The disjunction between the various levels of the process of civilizational self-recovery of Armenians became obvious as early as the second half of the 18th century. In particular, trade capital, its main source of energy, was smothered; and so was the associate class of entrepreneurs, which was the most interested in the establishment of national statehood of a modern type. To repeat, it did not manage to restructure its activities in accordance with the entrepreneurial principles of its time. Therefore, statehood was not restored. Starting from the 5th century, Armenian national culture was the one to face the domestic and international challenges of civilization. At the dawn of the Early Modern period, Armenian culture was steadily developing and consuming the achievements of contemporary social thought. The best evidence of that was the birth of Armenian typography in 1512. The period was further marked by the creation of a wide network of modern schools in the various corners of the world: from Venice to Madras and Calcutta, from Constantinople to Etchmiadzin, from New Nakhijevan to Moscow. The emerging new scientific paradigms in the Armenian environment were impressive. The activities of the

³⁷ Aslanian, *From the Indian Ocean*, 214.

³⁸ Ioannisian, *Iosif Emin*, 295.

³⁹ See Anasyan, *XVII dari azatagrakan sharzhumnern*, 10.

⁴⁰ Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean world*, 2:865-91.

⁴¹ See Ashot Hovhannisyanyan's review of Anasyan, *XVII dari azatagrakan sharzhumnern*, in *Patma-banasirakan handes* 1 (1963): 235-48.

⁴² Leo, *Khojayakan kapitalē*, 219.

⁴³ See the review of Anasyan's volume by Vazgen A. Hakobyan, "Metsarzhkek' menagrut'yun" (A valuable monograph), *Teghekgagir (Hasarakakan gitut'yunneri)* 9, (1962): 87; Manvel K. Zulalyan, *Arevmtyan Hayastanē XVI-XVIII darenin* (Western Armenia in the 16th-18th centuries) (Yerevan: Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences, 1980), 371.

Mekhitarist congregation, born in 1717 owing to the efforts of Mkhit'ar Sebastats'i, are undeniable. The attempts to restore national statehood were not abandoned even in 1827, when Yerevan was taken. "This time the 'algorithm of actions' had an aim to see an Armenian sovereignty restored within the confines of the territory called the Armenian Oblast (Province)."⁴⁴

CONCLUSION

Within the context of the "civilizational shifts" of the Early Modern period (16th-17th c.), radical changes are obvious in all spheres of social life, from manufacturing technologies to social thought and state structures. As a result, the ties between the various branches of the economies of advanced countries became even tighter and more systemized. They created conditions for the activation and increasing role of "world-economies." Parallely, the Armenian trade network also emerged as a "world-economy." It embraced a huge ethnic and political complex and connected different foreign "world-economies." It had its geographic center – New Jugha which served as a junction point of the "power levers" spreading to the East and to the West that organized, set, and, to some extent, also managed the huge current of international land commerce. Its predominance created a network that united Surat, Madras, Calcutta, Constantinople, Smyrna, Moscow, Krakow, Lvov, Venice, Amsterdam, and other centers. The circulated capital was impressive.

The emerging system also served the purpose of recovering Armenian national life by facilitating the move from a pre-Industrial society to an Industrial one. Hence, the Armenians were on the way of modernization, which would make possible the reestablishment of the "once existent harmonious relationships between cultural meaning and civilizational sign." However, the successful completion of this mission could only be possible through a proportionate response to the civilizational challenges of the times. Among these, the three most important responses were: 1) the transference of caravan and land commerce to an "oceanic" environment in accordance with the latest technologies of trade and economy; b) the mastering of the newest banking technologies and the provision of new perspectives for the development of capital; c) the effort of restoring national statehood on solid ground in order to instigate the formation of the modern national state for the Armenians. As further developments showed, Armenian merchants did not manage to shed the burden of tradition nor make sufficient radical transformations to their activities to adapt to new environments. The effort to restore statehood did not bring about the anticipated result either as an Armenian state was not established.

Smbat Hovhannisyan is a Associate Professor in World History at Yerevan State University

⁴⁴ Hovhannisyan, *Drvagner*, 1:638.